## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE AT NASHVILLE

CARLOS LEVY,	)	
Petitioner,	DUDSM	6
v.	) No. 1:10-00005 Fun M	flow to
DAVID MILLS, Warden,	No. 1:10-00005  Judge Haynes  Solid D with a  forenew. The Red  lefenden is appoint  lefenden forenen	at Preblemal Peebl
Respondent.	Seprenden skyper	in fele on
	Sunded /	whom
M0	OTION TO DISMISS y rices	sou d
	V.	UXXX

P. 12(b)(6) to dismiss the petition for writ of habeas corpus in the above referenced case on grounds that it was filed outside the one-year statute of limitations applicable to federal habeas applications.<sup>1</sup> 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). In support of this motion, the respondent relies upon the pleadings in this case, the memorandum of law filed in support of this motion, and the following portions of the state-court record submitted as attachments hereto, specifically:

The respondent, David Mills, Warden, moves this court pursuant to Fed. R. Civ.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Although Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) does not expressly include a defense based on statute of limitations, the Sixth Circuit has held that the defense may be raised by motion to dismiss when it is apparent on the face of the complaint that the time for filing the complaint has passed. *Hoover v. Langston Assocs.*, *Inc.*, 958 F.2d 742, 744 (6th Cir. 1992). Respondent submits that petitioner's pleadings in this case, particularly the statement of relevant dates and events triggering the applicable statute of limitations, establish the defense asserted in respondent's motion.